

The expanded training complex will save Ellsworth \$23 million per year in training costs by reducing the need for the B-1 bombers to commute to other places, such as Nevada and Utah, for training.

Supporting our men and women in uniform—like our airmen at Ellsworth—is one of the most important jobs we have as Members of Congress.

This year I am proud to report that the Senate passed a national defense authorization bill that incorporates a number of critical reforms that will expand the resources available to our servicemembers and strengthen our national security. The National Defense Authorization Act for 2016 tackles waste and inefficiency at the Department of Defense and focuses funding on our warfighters rather than on the Pentagon bureaucracy.

The bill also overhauls our military retirement system. Before this bill, the system limited retirement benefits to servicemembers who had served for 20 years or more, which means huge numbers of military personnel, including many veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, retired after years of service without having accrued any retirement benefits. The National Defense Authorization Act replaces this system with a new retirement system that will ensure that the majority of our Nation's servicemembers receive retirement benefits for their years of service to our country even if they have not reached the 20-year mark.

The bills I have discussed today are just a few of the accomplishments of the Republican-led Senate. Over the course of this year, we have passed a number of significant pieces of legislation that will benefit Americans for years to come.

We have worked hard to help our Nation's veterans by expanding access to mental health resources, reducing wait times for medical care, and increasing the number of providers who can serve veterans. We voted to repeal ObamaCare and start the process of moving toward the real health care reform Americans are looking for: an affordable, accountable, patient-focused system that puts individuals in control of their health care decisions. We passed legislation to contain the out-of-control bureaucracy at the EPA and legislation to begin the process of safeguarding Medicare and Social Security by putting them on a more sustainable financial footing going forward. We passed cyber security legislation to protect Americans' privacy and a major education reform bill that puts States, parents, teachers, and local school boards—not Washington bureaucrats—in charge of our children's education.

While we may have accomplished a lot this year, we know there is still a lot more that needs to be done. Americans are still suffering in the Obama economy, and our Nation continues to face terrorist threats at home and abroad.

Whether it is enacting pro-economic growth policies at home or ensuring that our military has the resources it needs to protect us from threats abroad, Republicans will redouble our efforts to make sure Washington is meeting the needs of American families and addressing the American people's priorities. We plan to spend the second year of the 114th Congress next year the way we have spent the first: fighting to make our economy stronger, our government more efficient and more accountable, and our Nation and our world safer and more secure.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, one of the brightest bright spots at the Paris climate talks last week was the robust corporate presence. Leading businesses and executives from around the world were there in Paris to voice their support for a strong international climate agreement. That brings me here today for the now 122nd time to say that it is time for America's leading corporations and their lobbyists to bring that same message here to Washington to help Congress wake up.

Let me use an example of two of the good guys. The two biggest drinks companies in America are Coca-Cola and PepsiCo. Coke and Pepsi both signed this public letter urging strong climate action in Paris:

Dear U.S. and global leaders:

Now is the time to meaningfully address the reality of climate change. We are asking you to embrace the opportunity presented to you in Paris. . . . We are ready to meet the climate challenges that face our businesses. Please join us in meeting the climate challenges that face the world.

And it is not just that public letter; Coca-Cola's Web site says it will reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 25 percent and that to do so, "Coca-Cola will work to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions across its value chain, making comprehensive carbon footprint reductions across its manufacturing processes, packaging formats, delivery fleet, refrigeration equipment and ingredient sourcing."

Coca-Cola also says: "We continue to partner with peer companies, bottling partners, NGOs, governments and others in addressing our greenhouse gas emissions and encouraging progress in response to climate change."

Pepsi's Web site heralds what it calls "its commitment to action on climate

change" and announces that it has signed both the Ceres BICEP Climate Declaration in the United States and the Prince of Wales's Corporate Leaders Group Trillion Tonne Communique in the UK. These commitments, they say, "are part of PepsiCo's overall strategy to address climate change by working across its business and with global leaders."

Here is Indra Nooyi, chairman and CEO of PepsiCo:

Combating climate change is absolutely critical to the future of our company, customers, consumers—and our world. I believe all of us need to take action now.

I have corresponded with these companies about climate change, and here is what they have said in their letters to me.

In March 2013, Coke said:

We recognize that climate change is a critical challenge facing our planet, with potential impacts on biodiversity, water resources, public health, and agriculture. Beyond the effects on the communities we serve, we view climate change as a potential business risk, understanding that it could likely have direct and indirect effects on our business.

As a responsible global company, with operations in more than 200 countries, we have a role to play in climate protection. . . .

Then in May 2014:

The Coca-Cola Company has strongly stated that climate change is happening and the implications of climate change for our planet are profound and wide-ranging. It is our belief that climate change may have long-term direct and indirect implications for our business and supply chain and we recognize that sustainability is core to our long-term value. . . . Climate protection is a key component of our business strategy.

In August of this year:

Coca-Cola joined twelve other corporations at the White House pledging our support for the American Business Act on Climate [Pledge]. Climate protection has been a key focus of Coca-Cola for decades.

In a letter of February 2013, Pepsi said:

PepsiCo applauds your efforts to address climate change by focusing Congressional attention on the issue. . . . At PepsiCo, we recognize the adverse impacts that greenhouse gas emissions have on global temperatures, weather patterns, and the frequency and severity of extreme weather and natural disasters. These impacts may have significant implications for our company. . . . Accordingly, responding to climate change is integrated into PepsiCo's business strategy.

In September of this year, Pepsi wrote:

We look forward to providing further support on the "Road to Paris"—demonstrating that actions by business in climate are not only good for the environment, but good for business.

That is all great stuff. Here is where it gets a little strange. Coke and Pepsi have a trade association, the American Beverage Association, that lobbies for the soft drink industry, and they also support the business lobbying group, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Indeed, the American Beverage Association sits on the board of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and contributes to it a lot of money.

Here is the official position of the American Beverage Association on climate change from its Web site:

Each of America's beverage companies has set goals to lower our emissions over time while continually improving efficiency. And our companies have pledged to work with government leaders, environmental organizations, and other businesses to ensure these emission reductions are happening throughout the United States.

They even have the Beverage Industry Environmental Roundtable. But do they lobby us about this in Congress? I have never seen any sign of it. When the American Beverage Association thought Congress might impose a soda tax to fund health care, then they lobbied like crazy—nearly \$30 million worth of lobbying expenditure. They know how to lobby when they want to. But on climate, I have never seen it.

As for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, everyone in Congress knows that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is dead set against Congress doing anything serious about climate change. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is a very powerful lobby group, and its power in Congress is fully dedicated to stopping any serious climate legislation. They are implacable adversaries of climate action, and we see their hostility everywhere.

At one point, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce wrote to me to say I mischaracterized its position on climate change. "Even a cursory review of our stated views on climate change," wrote Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Tom Donahue, "shows that the Chamber is not debating the existence of climate change or that human activity plays a role."

Well and good, but here is what I wrote back.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my full letter at the end of my remarks.

I wrote back:

I am in politics in Washington, and I see the behavior of your organization firsthand. There is no way to reconcile what I see in real life around me with the assurances in your letter that you treat the climate problem in any way seriously.

I then offered a list of the many ways the U.S. Chamber of Commerce actively opposes climate legislation and concluded:

In every practical way in which your organization brings pressure to bear on the American political process, I see you bringing it to bear in line with the big carbon polluters and the climate denial industry. And given the powerful and relentless way in which you bring that pressure to bear on our system in the service of your own First Amendment rights, I hope you will accept that I have the right to express my own views under that same First Amendment.

In sum, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has a terrible record on climate change. It is Coke and Pepsi's adversary on getting anything done. So why is Coke and Pepsi's American Beverage Association on the board of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce?

The result is that Coke and Pepsi take one position on climate change in

their public materials and in Paris and throughout their internal corporate effort, but here in Congress, where the rubber meets the road on legislating and where the lobbying meets our legislative efforts, their lobbying agencies don't support their position. I actually wonder how well they know in the executive suites of Coke and Pepsi that their position is not supported by the lobbying effort they support.

Let me be clear. I am not here to ask that companies such as Coke and Pepsi take a different position on climate change than what they believe. I am here to ask companies to line up their advocacy in Congress with what they believe. My ask is simple: Match your advocacy in Congress with your policy. Don't outsource your advocacy to entities that take the opposite position from you—not on an issue of this magnitude. This is too important an issue for great American companies to say one thing when they are talking to the public and have their lobbying agencies say something completely different when they come to Congress.

I have asked Coke and Pepsi about this discrepancy between their policy and these organizations' advocacy, and here is what they say. From Pepsi:

The Chamber is an important partner for PepsiCo on critical tax and trade matters. However, our positions on climate change have diverged.

From Coke:

The Coca-Cola Company belongs to a wide range of organizations through which we gain different perspectives on global and national issues; however these groups do not speak on our behalf.

Well, if their positions have diverged and these organizations don't speak for them on this issue, why keep supporting one of the leading political opponents of meaningful climate action? If you insist on supporting the entities that lobby against you on climate change, then the question becomes this: What are you doing in Congress to lobby back? What are your countermeasures to dispel the voice of these agencies that you are supporting?

Climate change is not just any other issue. It is so big an issue that the world's leaders just gathered in Paris to address it in the largest gathering of world leaders in history. It is so big an issue that it has its own page on Coke's and Pepsi's Web sites and, indeed, on the Web sites of most major American corporations. It is so big an issue that our former Pacific commander, Admiral Locklear, said it was the biggest national security threat we face in the Pacific theater. To use Admiral Locklear's exact words, climate change "is probably the most likely thing that is going to happen . . . that will cripple the security environment, probably more likely than the other scenarios we all often talk about."

Around here in Congress, the bullying menace of the fossil fuel industry is everywhere. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is their vocal advocate. If companies such as Coke and Pepsi

don't push back against this group that they fund, that choice has real consequences here. That choice says to Congress: "This issue isn't really serious to us." That choice says to the individual Members over here: "If you cross the fossil fuel boys, don't count on us to have your back."

I recently received a letter from ExxonMobil. It says:

ExxonMobil has for a number of years held the view that a "revenue-neutral carbon tax" is the best option. . . . [A] carbon tax could help create the conditions to reduce greenhouse emissions in a way that spurs new efficiencies and new technologies.

This is ExxonMobil.

The revenue-neutral carbon tax could be a workable policy framework for countries around the world—and the policy most likely to preserve the ability of every sector of society to seek out new efficiencies and new technologies.

ExxonMobil may say that in their letter, but let me say as the author of the Senate's revenue-neutral carbon-fee bill, I can assure you that bill is getting zero support from ExxonMobil. ExxonMobil is playing a double game, with statements such as they made in the letter to me on the one hand, but on the other hand all of its massive lobbying clout directed against doing anything serious on climate.

I suggest that it is the same with the other companies. They may have enough happy talk about climate change being serious to get them through a cocktail party at Davos, but the full weight of their industry lobbying leverage, through the Chamber and the American Petroleum Institute and a slew of other front groups, is leaned in hard against climate legislation, including revenue-neutral carbon fees. We should perhaps expect better of them. But we should certainly expect better of other companies that don't have ExxonMobil's massive conflict of interest.

To be fair to Coke and Pepsi, they are not alone. Congress is heavily influenced by corporations. That is no news flash. What my colleagues here all know is that virtually zero of that corporate influence is brought to bear in support of climate action. Even companies with good internal climate policies, even companies that are leaders in what they are doing within their companies and within their supply chains on climate change shy away from this issue in Congress.

The result is that, on one side, the fossil fuel industry maintains a desperate grip on Congress to stop any climate action. They lean on Congress hard to get their way. On the other side, the rest of corporate America has virtually nothing to say in Congress on climate change. Maybe they do on their Web sites, maybe in their public relations, certainly through their sustainability departments, and in some cases from their CEOs. But from their lobbyists and from the trade associations and the lobbying organizations that represent them here in Congress, the silence is deafening.

The corporate effort in Congress to get something done on climate change rounds to zero. I am in Congress, and I am here to say we need you guys to show up. I get that it is never convenient to stand up to bullies. It is always easier if they just go away, but the fossil fuel bullies are not going away. So it is either stand up to them or keep letting them roll Congress.

If what Coke and Pepsi and other corporations say publicly are the things they really believe, then it should be important to them that Congress not get rolled by the guys who are working against what they believe. This should not be too big an ask for the corporations that stood up in Paris: Do the same thing in Congress. Do the same thing in Congress. Do the simplest and truest of things: Stand up for what you believe.

It is time to wake up, but it is also time to stand up, and what a difference you will make.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXXONMOBIL CORPORATION,  
Washington, DC, December 2, 2015.

Hon. EDWARD J. MARKEY,

*U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,

*U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,

*U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.*

Hon. ELIZABETH WARREN,

*U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS: As to your question about Donors Trust and Donors Capital, we had never heard of these organizations until you brought them to our attention. We do not provide funding to them.

At ExxonMobil we too have been following the deliberately misleading stories regarding our company published by the climate activist organization InsideClimate News and by various media outlets. If you are interested in our response, please visit our corporate blog: <http://www.exxonmobilperspectives.com>.

From the very beginning of concern about climate change, ExxonMobil scientists and engineers have been involved in discussions and analysis of climate change. These efforts started internally as early as the 1970s. They led to work with the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and collaboration with academic institutions and to reaching out to policymakers and others, who sought to advance scientific understanding and policy dialogue.

We believe the risks of climate change are serious and warrant thoughtful action. We also believe that by taking sound and wise actions now we can better mitigate and manage those risks. But as policymakers work to reduce emissions, it is critical to recognize the importance of reliable and affordable energy in supporting human progress across society and the economy.

Sound tax, legal, and regulatory frameworks are essential. With sound policies enacted, investment, innovation, and cooperation can flourish. In our view, policy works best when it maintains a level playing field; opens the doors for competition; and refrains from picking winners and losers.

When considering policy options to address the risks of climate change, we urge you to

draw from the best insights from economics, science, and engineering. The U.S. has achieved remarkable reductions in not just greenhouse gas intensity measures, but in absolute levels of carbon dioxide emissions as a result of large-scale fuel switching from coal to natural gas for electricity generation. Thoughtful regulatory initiatives directed to both energy and building efficiency standards, as well as continued improvements in emissions levels related to industrial processes, have also contributed to the reduction in the nation's greenhouse gas emissions.

As you consider additional policy options, such as putting a more direct cost on carbon to incentivize different choices, we suggest that these policies ensure a uniform and predictable carbon cost across the economy and allow competitive market forces to drive solutions. We believe this approach will maximize transparency, reduce complexity, and promote global participation.

You are probably aware that ExxonMobil has for a number of years held the view that a "revenue-neutral carbon tax" is the best option to fulfill these key principles. Instead of subsidies and mandates that distort markets, stifle innovation, and raise energy costs, such a carbon tax could help create the conditions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in a way that spurs new efficiencies and new technologies. The revenue-neutral carbon tax could be a workable policy framework for countries around the world—and the policy most likely to preserve the ability of every sector of society to seek out new efficiencies and new technologies.

Sincerely,

THERESA M. FARIELLO,  
*Vice President, Washington Office.*

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRESIDENT'S STRATEGY TO DEFEAT ISIS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, just yesterday President Obama went to the Pentagon for a long overdue meeting with his national security advisers. During that meeting or shortly thereafter, he made this statement: "We are hitting ISIL harder than ever." Unfortunately, the President failed to acknowledge the simple fact that his strategy against ISIL—or ISIS, as it is more frequently called—is simply not working.

This is pretty hard to get right, but at least our leaders should have the humility to recognize reality, and when things aren't working out so well, reconsider and make some midcourse changes so they do work—not this President. I have said repeatedly that the President needs to tell Congress and the American people about his comprehensive strategy to defeat this terrorist enemy, and he has to do more to give our military the flexibility and resources they need to accomplish the

mission. It is simply wrong to ask our military to accomplish something and not give them the freedom, flexibility, and resources they need in order to accomplish it.

That is why when the President talks about airstrikes—I know of no military leader who believes that you can defeat this terrorist army in Syria and Iraq by airstrikes alone. Nobody. Yet that seems to be the only tactic this President is using. So the President needs to tell the American people the truth about the realities on the ground in Iraq and Syria. He needs to listen and take advice from the military leadership he has at the Pentagon and on his own staff. Above all, he needs to learn not to be ashamed of American leadership.

It is absolutely true that America doesn't necessarily need to fight the wars for other countries in the region that ought to be engaged in the fight themselves, but the fact is there is no one else on the planet who can lead like the United States of America. We have to organize it, we have to lead it, and we have to support it if we expect other people to be the boots on the ground to fight those wars, but the action we are seeing currently from this administration does not match the very serious threat we face, and it is a threat that has gotten worse, not better, under the President.

CIA Director John Brennan recently estimated that before President Obama prematurely pulled all U.S. troops out of Iraq, without any sort of transition at all, the predecessor of ISIS, known as Al Qaeda in Iraq, had "maybe 700-or-so adherents left." This is the CIA Director, nominated by President Obama and confirmed by the Senate. He said, before the President pulled the plug in Iraq, there were about 700 or so adherents left in Al Qaeda in Iraq, the predecessor of ISIS. If we fast forward that to today, according to the New York Times, just a few months ago, he said: "Nearly 30,000 foreign recruits have now poured in to Syria, many to join the Islamic State, a doubling of volunteers in the last 12 months. . . ."

Nearly 30,000 foreign recruits, a doubling of volunteers in just the last 12 months, these are pretty amazing and concerning numbers but more often they demonstrate how out of touch the President's remarks are when he says ISIS has been contained or we are hitting them harder than we ever have before. It is simply not working. Clearly, we need the President to execute an effective military strategy that results in both the physical destruction of ISIS and the complete rejection of their bankrupt ideology—not just in the Middle East but around the world, including here at home.

Frequently, when various pundits react when they hear people like me saying the President doesn't have an effective strategy, they say: OK. What is your strategy? First of all, I am not the Commander in Chief, but we did make some constructive suggestions to